

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO	
10/702,419	11/05/2003	John N. Hryn	0003/01398	8338	
27197	7590 07/28/2005		EXAM	INER	
	& FLAYNIK	•	ALEXANDER	ALEXANDER, MICHAEL P	
THE CIVIC OPERA BUILDING 20 NORTH WACKER DRIVE, SUITE 1447		447	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
CHICAGO, II			1742	•	
· ·			DATE MAILED: 07/28/2004	DATE MAILED: 07/28/2005	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	A	A				
	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Summer:	10/702,419	HRYN ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Michael P. Alexander	1742				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be time within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status	•					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>06 April 2004</u> .						
2a) ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☑ This	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.					
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is						
closed in accordance with the practice under E	x parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45	i3 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims						
4) Claim(s) <u>1-20</u> is/are pending in the application.						
4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>8-20</u> is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6) Claim(s) <u>1-7</u> is/are rejected.						
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.	- alastian manuinamant					
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	r election requirement.					
Application Papers						
9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine	r.					
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the	- ' '					
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex		·				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:	priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)	-(d) or (f).				
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.						
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No						
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage						
application from the International Bureau	· · · ·					
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list	of the certified copies not receive	a.				
Attachment(s)						
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary	(PTO-413)				
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Da	ite				
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	atent Application (PTO-152)				
S. Patent and Trademark Office						

186

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- I. Claims 1-7, drawn to an electrolyte for the electrolysis of alumina, classified in class 205, subclass 372.
- II. Claims 8-20, drawn to a method for electrolyzing alumina, classified in class 205, subclass 373.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions I and II are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case the product as claimed can be used in a process using consumable anodes and having an electrolyte concentration of less than 35 mol% potassium fluoride.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

During a telephone conversation with Michael Cherskov on 21 July 2005 a provisional election was made without traverse to prosecute the invention of I, claims 1-7.

Affirmation of this election must be made by applicant in replying to this Office action. Claims 8-20 are withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner, 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a non-elected invention.

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

Claim 4 states that the concentrations of the electrolyte's components remain constant during electrolysis. The specification only states that the method allows the concentration of the electrolyte's components to remain **relatively** constant. Since electrolysis removes aluminum ions from the electrolyte, it would not be apparent to one skilled in the art how to maintain the electrolyte's components constant during electrolysis.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-2 and 4-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Brown et al. (U.S. Pat. 6,379,512 B1).

Regarding claim 1, Brown et al. '512 disclose (col. 6 lines 31-38) an electrolyte for the electrolysis of alumina, the electrolyte comprising a mixture of aluminum fluoride and potassium fluoride.

Regarding claim 2, Brown et al. '512 disclose (col. 6 lines 31-38) that the electrolyte would have aluminum fluoride present in a molar ratio with potassium fluoride greater than 1:1.

Regarding claim 4, Brown et al. '512 disclose (col. 19 lines 34-38) replenishing the metal ingredient by adding it to the bath. The Examiner asserts that this would maintain the concentrations of the electrolyte's components relatively constant.

Regarding claim 5, Brown et al. '512 disclose (col. 6 lines 8-16) that the electrolyte is used to electrolyze the alumina to aluminum at from 680-800 degrees C.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and

Application/Control Number: 10/702,419

Art Unit: 1742

the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

- 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
- 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
- 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
- 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 3 and 6-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brown et al. '512 as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of (no secondary reference).

Regarding claim 3, Brown et al. '512 disclose (col. 6 lines 62-63) that the electrolyte further comprises from 1-2 wt.% alumina, which overlaps the applicant's claimed range of about 2 to 6 wt.% alumina. It has been held that a prima facie case of obviousness exists where the prior art range overlaps or lies within that of the claimed invention. See MPEP 2144.05 I. It would have been obvious to one or ordinary skill in the art at the time of the claimed invention to select a alumina concentration of 2 wt.% alumina from the range of Brown et al. '512 because Brown et al. '512 disclose that the entire range has the same utility.

Regarding claim 6, Brown et al. '512 disclose (col. 6 lines 55-63) that the bath would be molten during the electrolysis.

Regarding claim 7, Brown et al. '512 disclose (col. 7 lines 17-23) the use of titanium diboride composite cathodes and copper/nickel/iron anodes, which would be wettable cathodes and inert anodes.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael P. Alexander whose telephone number is 571-272-8558. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Roy V. King can be reached on 571-272-1244. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

M/4 mpa

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1700